

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-19, and 26-29 of the present application are pending. Claims 1, 11, and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. In addition, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Pat. No. 6,511,035, issued to Teel et al. (hereinafter Teel). Further, claims 3 and 13 of the present application stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of United States Pat. No. 5,170,104, issued to Laughlin (hereinafter Laughlin), claims 7, 17, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of United States Pat. No. 6,241,435, issued to Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang). For the reasons set forth below the Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11, and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. The Applicants respectfully submit that the specification and claims 1, 11, and 26 define the Applicant's interpretation of a platform. Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Applicants definition of a platform is consistent with the usage within the art of vibration control equipment and devices. For example, the present application uses the term "platform" consistent with the usage in the Teel reference. (See Col. 3, l.16-24).

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Teel. For a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every element of the claimed invention. (See MPEP §2131). Claims 1 and 11 of the present application is directed to a platform assembly that supports a vibration-sensitive payload configured to be supported by one or more legs and includes a platform having a first surface coupled to a vibration-sensitive payload, a second surface, and a honeycomb inner core located between and coupled to the first and second surfaces, and at least one vibration sensor located within said inner core and configured to sense a vibration of a surface of the platform.

Teel is directed to an active vibration isolation system. More specifically, Figure 2 of Teel shows a table assembly 10 having a *platform 12* supported by a plurality of *legs 14*. In the Office Action the Examiner states "Teel et al. discloses a platform assembly that could be supported by one or more legs, with a table (10) that has a first surface (12) coupled to a vibration-sensitive payload, a second surface (bottom of 14), and an inner core (portion inside of 12 and 14) located between the first and second surfaces." The Applicants direct the

Examiner's attention to Column 3, lines 16-29, which state:

"Referring to the drawings more particularly by reference numbers, FIG. 2 shows an embodiment of a table assembly 10 of the present invention. The assembly 10 may include a platform 12 that is supported by a plurality of legs 14 that extend from a floor 16. The platform 12 may have a honeycomb construction and include a plurality of mounting holes 18 that allow items such as optical mounts to be attached to the table 10. As an alternate embodiment, the platform 12 may be constructed from a slab of granite.

The table assembly 10 may include one or more vibration isolators 30 mounted to the table legs 14. The floor 16 may undergo a vibrational movement that creates a displacement of the table legs 14. The isolators 30 isolate an element such as the platform 12 from the displacement of the floor 16."

As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teel clearly defined the platform and legs as separate and distinct elements of the table assembly 10. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has mischaracterized the legs 14 of the table assembly 10 as a second surface of the platform of claims 1 and 11.

Further, claim 1 of the present application includes at least one vibration sensor located within the *honeycomb inner core of the platform*. As stated above, Teel clearly defined the platform and legs as separate and distinct elements of the table assembly 10. Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that within the field of vibration control devices the term "core" would not be considered to include the legs of the table assembly 10 as proffered by the Examiner. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teel fails to disclose at least one vibration sensor location within the core of the platform as recited in claims 1 and 11 of the present application. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teel fails to teach every element of the device of claim 1 in accordance with MPEP §2131. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Teel. Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12, 15, 16, 19, which variously depend from claims 1 and 11, are similarly allowable over Teel.

In addition, if the Examiner is taking official notice as to the definition of "platform" or "core", the Examiner needs to so state and provide documentary evidence. Official notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken by the Examiner when the facts asserted to be well known or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and

unquestionable demonstration as being well known. See MPEP 2144.03. Applicants assert that without supporting documentary evidence, interpreting these terms in a manner inconsistent with the interpretation provided in the specification and claims of the present application is improper and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration

Claims 3 and 13 of the present application stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of Laughlin. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, two basic criteria must be met by the Examiner. First, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. In addition, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (See MPEP §2143.03). As discussed above, Teel fails to teach or suggest a platform having a platform assembly that supports a vibration-sensitive payload and includes a platform having a first surface coupled to a vibration-sensitive payload, a second surface, and a honeycomb inner core located between and coupled to the first and second surfaces, and at least one vibration sensor located within said inner core and configured to sense a vibration of a surface of the platform. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither Teel nor Laughlin, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 3 and 13 in accordance with MPEP §2143.03.

Claims 7, 17, and 26-29 of the present application stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of Huang. Huang is directed to a universal adaptive machining chatter control fixture. Like Teel, Huang fails to teach or suggest a platform having a first surface and a second surface and a honeycomb inner core positioned therebetween and coupled thereto, the inner core having at least one vibration sensor positioned therein. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither Teel nor Huang, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 7, 17, and 26-29 of the present application in accordance with MPEP §2143.03.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated "[w]hile the device taught by Teel is not designed to be used within another table, it certainly could be placed on another table resulting in the device being supported by one or more legs." The Applicants respectfully content that setting the table assembly of Teel on the platform of the recited in the claims of the present application is inoperable. Further, such a configuration would not provide the vibration damping capabilities of the present device. As stated above, Teel is directed to vibration isolation. As such, the Teel device isolates the platform 12 supported by the legs 14 vibrations transmitted from the floor 16 to the platform 12. In contrast, the device recited in the claims of the present application is directed to detecting and mitigating the effects of

vibrations within the platform. Vibration isolation device such as the Teel device cannot address vibrations within the platform.

If the Examiner feels for any reason that direct contact with Applicant's attorney will advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number given below.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-3411 (Docket No. 155603-0311).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 17, 2007

By: Brian F. Swienton
Brian F. Swienton,
Reg. No. 49,030

Newport Corporation
1791 Newport Center Drive
Irvine, CA 91711